

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 14-15, 17-23, and 25-28 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 14-15, 17-23, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,081,780 (Lumelsky) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), and in view of Saon, et al., "Maximum Likelihood Discriminant Feature Spaces", IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, Vol. 2, June 1000, pgs. 1129-1132. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, and 21, and has added new claims 29-32. No new matter was introduced.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the section 103 rejections of claims 1, 11, and 21.

Applicant has described Lumelsky in the response filed on May 30, 2008. Lumelsky is directed to enabling content providers with authoring tools to provide a highly compressed voice content. Lumelsky discloses an authoring system that generates prosody parameters based on individual speech, and then uses them during the speech synthesis at the user terminal. The authoring system includes three processes. First, an authoring system produces prosodic features according to the linguistic structure of a message, and uses them to create a synthetic speech. Second, the authoring system compares the synthetic speech with the actually spoken (natural) speech, determining corrective feedback to the prosodic variables. Third, the authoring system produces a final combination of the prosodic features with phonemes derived from the original text in a sequence ready to be stored, transmitted and then synthesized by user terminal. An editing process employs a graphic or text editor which assembles all the analysis data in a convenient form for representing it to an operator on a terminal screen. As a result of this speech authoring process, the speech signal output at the user terminal sounds like the speech produced by the human being on whom the allophone dictionary was based.

Thus, Lumelsky's speech synthesis is based on the allophone context tables converter and one or more dictionaries, whereas the speech synthesis recited in Applicant's claims 1,

11, and 21 is based on the spoken audio signal. Lumelsky does not teach or suggest using the spoken audio signal to specify the pronunciation of the output signal. The speech synthesis recited in Applicant's claims 1, 11 and 21 provides the speaker with the ability to override the output of Lumelsky's allophone context tables converter, which is not taught or suggested by Lumelsky. The AAPA cited by the Examiner is directed to the alignment of the text string and the acoustic feature data, and thus does not rectify this deficiency of Lumelsky. Thus, Applicant urges that the combination of Lumelsky and AAPA does not teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1, 11, and 21, and therefore that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of those claims over Lumelsky and AAPA cannot be maintained. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5, 7-10, 14-15, 17-20, 22-23 all depend from either claims 1, 11, or 21, respectively, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11, and 21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The Examiner cited Saon as disclosing the subject matter now recited in new claims 29-32. However, Saon is not directed to speech to text synthesis, and thus does not remedy the deficiencies of Lumelsky, discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant urges that claims 1, 4-5, 7-11, 14-15, 17-23 and new claims 29-32 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated. Early and favorable action on this case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/19/08

By: David L. Heath
David L. Heath
Reg. No. 46,763
Attorney for Applicant

Mailing Address:

**F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury NY 11797
(516) 692-8888
(516) 692-8889 (FAX)**